

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on August 23, 2004.

Claims 1-6, 8, 63, 65-71, 73-76, 84, and 86-88 are amended. Claim 90 has been cancelled. Claim 91 has been added. Claims 1-9, 63, 65-89, and 91 are now pending in this application.

### **Examiner Interview**

Applicants acknowledge the telephone interview held on October 21, 2004, between the Examiner and Applicants' attorney during which the independent and allowed claims were generally discussed, as well as the cited references Dibene, II et al. (U.S. 6,452,113) and Dibene, II et al. (U.S. 6,452,804). No agreement was reached. Applicants sincerely thank the Examiner for the interview.

### **Amendments to Claims 1-6, 8, 63, 65-71, 73-75, 84, and 86-88**

Claims 1-6, 8, 63, 65-71, 73-75, 84 and 86-88 are amended. No new matter has been introduced. The amendments to the claims are made to satisfy Applicants' preferences, not necessarily to satisfy any legal requirement(s) of the patent laws, and they are not intended to limit the scope of equivalents to which any claim element may be entitled.

In claims 1 and 63, "one of a thin-core substrate and a coreless substrate" has been added. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in original claim 4 and in the paragraph beginning on page 11, line 17.

In claim 63, "frame" has replaced "power/ground/impedance deliverer (PGID)". Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in the paragraph beginning on page 16, line 5 of the original disclosure.

In claim 76, "capacitor" has been added. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in original claim 90, and in Figure 9 with its corresponding text in the specification at page 13, line 8.

In claim 91, “wherein the capacitor includes an insulator” has been added. Support for this amendment may be found, for example, in Figure 9 and the corresponding text in the specification at page 13, line 8.

*Amendments to the Specification and Title*

The specification has been amended for clarity. No new matter has been added. “thin-core or coreless” has replaced “thin-coreless”. Support for the amendment is found, for example, in the first line of the same amended paragraph beginning on page 11, line 17. Applicants respectfully request that the amended paragraph be entered in this case to replace the previously pending paragraph.

The title has been amended to “PACKAGE STIFFENER” for clarity. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment is found, for example, in the paragraph beginning on page 11, line 17. Applicants respectfully request that the amended title be entered in this case to replace the previously pending title.

*§103 Rejection of the Claims*

Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 64-66, 68, 70, 74, 75, 82 and 83 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dibene, II et al. (U.S. 6,452,113) in view of Dibene, II et al. (U.S. 6,452,804). The rejection of independent claim 63 was mentioned on page 6 with other rejected claims. Accordingly, Applicants have assumed that claim 63 is also rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dibene (‘113) in view of Dibene (‘804).

Claims 76 and 89 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dibene, II et al. (U.S. 6,452,113) and Dibene, II et al. (U.S. 6,452,804), and further in view of Belady (U.S. 6,285,550).

Claims 2, 3, 67, 69, 71-73, 80, 81, 87 and 88 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dibene, II et al. (U.S. 6,452,113) and Dibene, II et al. (U.S. 6,452,804), and further in view of Dehaine et al. (U.S. 5,925,925).

Claim 8 was also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dibene, II et al. (U.S. 6,452,113) and Dibene, II et al. (U.S. 6,452,804), and further in view of Dehaine et al. and Banks et al. (U.S. 6,015,722).

Claim 76 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of allowable claim 90 as discussed below. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claim 76 has been put into condition for allowance.

The remaining rejections are respectfully traversed.

The references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim elements. M.P.E.P. § 2142 (citing *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1991)).

Applicants were not able to find that Dibene ('804) and/or Dibene ('113) teach each and every claim element of amended independent claims 1 and 63. In particular, it is respectfully submitted that Dibene ('804) and Dibene ('113) do not disclose "one of a thin-core substrate and a coreless substrate" as claimed in independent claims 1 and 63. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 63 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants believe the amended independent claims 1, 63, and 76 are patentable over the art of record, and that the amendments made herein are within the scope of a search properly conducted under the provisions of MPEP 904.02.

Claims 2-9, 78, 81-82, 84, 86, 88, and 89, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above, and Applicants respectfully request notification of same.

Claims 65-75, 77, 79-80, 83, and 85 which depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 63 and incorporate all of the limitations therein, are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above, and Applicants respectfully request notification of same.

Claims 87 and 91 depend directly from independent claim 76 and incorporate all of the limitations therein. Claims 87 and 91 are also asserted to be allowable for the reasons presented above, and Applicants respectfully request notification of same.

Applicants consider additional elements of claims 1-9, 63, 65-89 and 91 to further distinguish over the cited references, and Applicants reserve the right to present arguments to this effect at a later date.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 77-79, 84-86 and 90 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 77-79 depend from independent and allowable claim 1, and claims 84-86 depend from independent and allowable claim 63. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1 and 63 are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, claims 77-79 and 84-86 have not been rewritten.

Claim 90 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, claim 76. The Examiner indicated that this claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 76 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 90. Applicants believe that claim 76 is now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney, Lucinda Price (located in Gainesville, Florida), at (352) 373-8804, or Applicants' below-named representative (located in Minneapolis, Minnesota) to facilitate prosecution of this application. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

KRISTOPHER FRUTSCHY ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 349-9592

Date Nov. 20, 2004

By Ann M. McCrackin  
Ann M. McCrackin  
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 22 day of November 2004.

Chris Hammond

Name

Chris Hammond  
Signature